

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action dated July 28, 2004. Claims 24, 27, 29, 58, 59, 62, and 63-67 are presented for examination, of which Claims 24, 27, 62, 63, 64, and 67 are in independent form. Claims 24, 27, 62, and 63 have been amended to define still more clearly what Applicants regard as their invention. Claims 64-67 have been added to provide Applicants with a more complete scope of protection. Favorable reconsideration is requested.

Claims 24, 27, 29, 62, and 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement.

Without conceding the propriety of this rejection, Applicants have amended Claims 24, 27, 62, and 63 to read that the image processing performed by the external computer in the first copying mode is different from the image processing performed by the control unit in the second copying mode. Applicants submit that support for this feature may be found at least at page 30, lines 14-18, which states that “the device executes image processing alone to some extent, and the host computer 200 is preferably constituted to execute specific image processing”.¹ Applicants believe that the rejection under Section 112, first paragraph, has been obviated, and its withdrawal is, therefore, respectfully requested.

Claims 24, 27, 62, and 63 were rejected also under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

¹It is to be understood, of course, that the claim scope is not limited by the details of the described embodiments, which are referred to only to facilitate explanation.

Applicants have amended Claim 24 at lines 29-31 to recite that “*in the second copying mode*, the image signal from said scanner is transmitted to said control unit where *the image signal is processed* into the first processed image signal . . .” (emphasis added). Claim 63 has been amended similarly. As to the rejection of Claims 27 and 62, Applicants respectfully submit that lines 19-23 of Claim 27 and lines 15 and 16 of Claim 62 provide antecedent basis for the feature “the image processing in the second copying mode” recited in the last lines of these claims. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claims 24, 27, 62, and 63 comply fully with the requirements of Section 112, second paragraph, and respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejections under Section 112, second paragraph.

Claim 27 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,021, 892 (*Kita et al.*) in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,989,163 (*Kawamata et al.*). Claims 24, 59, 62, and 63 were rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kita et al.* in view of *Kawamata et al.*, as well as being unpatentable over *Kita et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,113,494 (*Menendez et al.*). Claim 29 was rejected under Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Kita et al.* in view of *Kawamata et al.*, and further in view of *Kochis et al.* Claim 58 was rejected under Section 103(a) as being patentable over *Kita et al.* in view of *Kawamata et al.*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,900,947 (*Kenmochi*), as well as being unpatentable over *Kita et al.* in view of *Menendez et al.*, and further in view of *Kenmochi*.

As shown above, Applicants have amended independent Claims 24, 27, 62, and 63 in terms that more clearly define what they regard as their invention. Applicants submit that these amended independent claims, together with the remaining claims

dependent thereon, are patentably distinct from the cited prior art for at least the following reasons.

The aspect of the present invention set forth in Claim 24 is an image processing device that includes a scanner, a control unit, a first bidirectional general-purpose interface, and a second bidirectional general-purpose interface. The scanner reads an image of a document and outputs an image signal. The control unit controls the image processing device and for performing image processing on the image signal output from the scanner to provide a first processed image signal. The image processing is processing that is necessary for copying. The first bidirectional general-purpose interface transmits, under control of the control unit, the image signal output by the scanner to an external computer, which performs image processing on the transmitted image signal to provide a second processed image signal. The image processing is processing that is necessary for copying. This interface is also for receiving the second processed image signal from the external computer. The second bidirectional general-purpose interface conforms to the same standard as the first bidirectional general-purpose interface, and is adapted for outputting the first processed image signal and the second processed image signal to a printer.

The image processing device of Claim 24 has a plurality of modes, including a read mode, a print mode, a first copying mode, performed in response to a copying designation by a user, and a second copying mode. In the first copying mode, the image signal from the scanner is transmitted to the external computer where the image signal is processed into the second processed image signal via the control unit and the first bidirectional general-purpose interface. Thereafter the second processed image signal is

transmitted to the printer via the first bidirectional interface, the control unit, and the second bidirectional general-purpose interface so as to perform copying based on the second processed image signal. In the second copying mode, the image signal from the scanner is transmitted to the control unit where the image signal is processed into the first processed image signal and the first processed image signal is transmitted to the printer via the second bidirectional general-purpose interface so as to perform copying based on the first processed image signal. The image processing performed by the external computer in the first copying mode is different from the image processing performed by the control unit in the second copying mode.

Among other notable features of Claim 24 is that the image processing performed by the external computer in the first copying mode is different from the image processing performed by the control unit in the second copying mode.

The applied art, alone or in combination, is not seen to disclose or suggest the aspects of the present invention defined by independent Claim 24, particularly with respect to that the image processing performed by the external computer in the first copying mode is different from the image processing performed by the control unit in the second copying mode.

As discussed previously, *Kita et al.* relates to a machine that has a read mode, which corresponds to the IMAGE INPUT function (column 6, line 68) and reading image data by the image scanner 2 and transferring the data to the host 8 (column 18, line 24 to column 20, line 12). Applicants further understand the *Kita et al.* device as having a print mode which corresponds to the IMAGE PRINT function (column 7, line 5) and recording image data generated in the host 8 by the image printer 3 (column 20, line 12 to

column 21, line 45). Further, *Kita et al.* has a second copying mode, corresponding to the COPY function of *Kita et al.* (column 6, line 50).

Applicants for the same reasons as discussed in the Amendment After Final Action filed April 23, 2004, and reproduced below, disagree with the assertion in the Office Action that the IMAGE INPUT function of *Kita et al.* corresponds to the first copying mode of Claim 24. Column 5, lines 65-68, of *Kita et al.* merely provides a list of timings/events (specifically four different events) when the image data codec control portion 69 is operated. However, no relationship between the operations of these events is stated or suggested. *Kita et al.* is silent about operations (1) to (3) being performed consecutively in response to a copy designation by a user. Assuming that operations (1) to (4) (device 1 is in a facsimile status, image data ready by the image scanner 2 is compressed and then transferred to the personal computer 8, compression data sent from the personal computer 8 is recorded by the image printer 3, and binary image data outputted from the personal computer 8 is transmitted via facsimile) are performed consecutively, Applicants fail to see a reason why operation (4) (binary image data outputted from the personal computer 8 is transmitted via facsimile) is performed in response to the copying designation.

Further, Applicants understand the IMAGE INPUT function of *Kita et al.* (column 6, line 65, to column 7, line 7) as transmitting image data read by the scanner 2 to the personal computer 8, which displays the image data on the CRT display and/or files the image data in a floppy disk. The IMAGE INPUT function, however, lacks the processing of the first copying mode of Claim 24, in which an image signal is output by a scanner to an external computer which performs image processing on the transmitted image signal to

provide a second processed image signal, where the image processing is necessary for a copying operation.

At page 5 of the Office Action, it is asserted that “the external computer performs no image processing on this data, while the external computer performs various image on data that is transferred to the external computer” and cites column 3, lines 46-48, and column 5, line 65, to column 6, line 5, as support thereof. Applicants understand that the external computer of *Kita et al.* (personal computer 8) can perform image processing. However, this image processing is not necessary for copying, namely printing an image by a printer based on an image signal outputted by a scanner. However, nothing has been found in *Kita et al.* that would teach or suggest that the image processing performed by the external computer in the first copying mode is different from the image processing performed by the control unit in the second copying mode, as recited in Claim 1. That is, personal computer 8 of *Kita et al.* does not perform image processing in accordance with a copying designation by a user.

For at least the above reason, Applicants submit that Claim 24 is clearly patentable over *Kita et al.*, taken alone.

Kawamata et al., *Menendez et al.*, *Kochis et al.*, and *Kenmochi* are not believed to add anything that would overcome the deficiencies of *Kita et al.* as a reference against Claim 24.

Accordingly, Claim 24 is believed to be clearly allowable over *Kita et al.*, *Kawamata et al.*, and *Menendez et al.*, taken separately or in any proper combination (if any).

Independent Claims 27, 62, 63, 64, and 67 include a feature similar to that discussed above in connection with Claim 24. Accordingly, Claims 27, 62, and 63 are believed to be patentable for substantially the same reasons as discussed above in connection with Claim 24.

The other claims in this application are each dependent from one or another of the independent claims discussed above and are therefore believed patentable for the same reasons. Since each dependent claim is also deemed to define an additional aspect of the invention, however, the individual consideration or reconsideration, as the case may be, of the patentability of each on its own merits is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration and early passage to issue of the present application.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our New York office by telephone at (212) 218-2100. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below listed address.

Respectfully submitted,


Ronald A. Clayton
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No.: 26,718

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO
30 Rockefeller Plaza
New York, New York 10112-3801
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200